

Serial No.: 10/713,310

Examiner: D. PARRIES

Title: METHOD, MEMORY MEDIA AND APPARATUS FOR DETECTION OF GRID DISCONNECT

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been editorially revised without adding new subject matter. Support for the revisions to claim 1, 6 and 11 can be found in Figures 2, 4 and 5, paragraphs 25-26 and 28-30 of the specification, and claims 4-5, 9-10 and 14-15. Claims 1-15 remain under consideration in the present application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Wall (US 2004/0178641). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for preventing islanding in a power system that includes a power grid having a feeder connected in circuit with a distributed generator and at least one load. The method claims determining a phase shift of a voltage based solely upon sequential frequency measurements at an output of said distributed generator and then issuing a command for a disconnect of a distributed generator from a feed if the phase shift based solely upon the sequential frequency measurements is greater than a threshold phase shift as required by claim 1.

The advisory action incorrectly asserts that Wall teaches continuously determining the phase shift of a voltage signal by taking multiple measurements of the signal over multiple periods of time, and that therefore, one could say that Wall teaches determining the phase shift of a voltage based solely on consecutive frequency measurements over multiple periods of time.

Since the invention of Wall requires simultaneous measurements of the frequency of the voltage signal taken at a single point in time common to the first and second phase locked loops to determine a phase shift that is used to issue a command for a disconnect of a generator, it is impossible for the invention of Wall to determine the phase shift of a

Serial No.: 10/713,310

Examiner: D. PARRIES

Title: METHOD, MEMORY MEDIA AND APPARATUS FOR DETECTION OF GRID DISCONNECT

Page 7 of 8

voltage based solely on sequential frequency measurements over multiple periods of time.

Unlike the invention of Wall, the claimed invention requires determining a phase shift based solely upon sequential frequency measurements and then issuing a command for a disconnect of a distributed generator from a feed if the determined phase shift based solely upon sequential frequency measurements is greater than a threshold phase shift as required by claim 1.

Nowhere does Wall teach or suggest determining a phase shift of a voltage based solely on sequential frequency measurements and then issuing a command for a disconnect of a distributed generator from a feed if the phase shift based solely upon the sequential frequency measurements is greater than a threshold phase shift as required by claim 1.

The patentable features of claims 6 and 11 correspond with the patentable features of claim 1 that claims determining a phase shift based solely on sequential frequency measurements and then issuing a command for a disconnect of a distributed generator from a feed if the phase shift based solely upon the sequential frequency measurements is greater than a threshold phase shift.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 6 and 11 are patentable over Wall.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wall in view of Pawate et al. (US 5,749,064). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons discussed above regarding the rejection of claims 1, 6 and 11, since claims 2 and 3 depend ultimately from claim 1, claims 7 and 8 depend ultimately from claim 6 and claims 12 and 13 depend ultimately from claim 11.

Serial No.: 10/713,310

Examiner: D. PARRIES

Title: METHOD, MEMORY MEDIA AND APPARATUS FOR DETECTION OF GRID DISCONNECT

Page 8 of 8

For at least these reasons, claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the cited art, alone or in combination, since they depend ultimately from claim 1 that is allowable. Claims 7 and 8 are patentable since they depend ultimately from claim 6 that is allowable. Claims 12 and 13 are patentable since they depend ultimately from claim 11 that is allowable.

Pawate et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of Wall. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection or the relevance of the cited art to the remaining features of claims 2-3, 7-8 and 12-13.

Claim Objections

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Claims 4 and 5 are patentable since they depend ultimately from claim 1 that is allowable. Claims 9 and 10 are patentable since they depend ultimately from claim 6 that is allowable. Claims 14 and 15 are patentable since they depend ultimately from claim 11 that is allowable.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (507) 351-4450.

006147

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 5, 2007

By:



Dwight N. Holmbo

Reg. No. 36,410

611 1st Street N

Waterville, MN 56096

507.351.4450

DNH/dnh